Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/667,039	WONG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel A Hess	2876
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>Daniel A Hess</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. Roy Anderson.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>20 November 2003</u> .		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-10, 12-16, 18-22</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed:		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's sign	ature, if required

2000年10月 - 10月 -

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413)

Application No. 09/667,039

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant's attorney, Mr. Anderson, referred to p. 8, paragraph 11 of the 10/07/2003 Office Action and offered to amend claim 1 by adding "dynamically" to claim 1, line 4 before "storing the data packet." The examiner indicated that this would require an additional search, and therefore would not be a proper amendment. In view of the foregoing, applicant's attorney agreed to cancel the rejected claims (1-10) to place the application in condition for allowance and to pursue prosecution of the rejected claims in a continuing application.